1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 5 JESSICA BENTON, SHELBY BRYANT, No. 2:20-CV-01174- RAJ 6 ANNE MARIE CAVANAUGH, ALYSSA GARRISON, AND CLARE THOMAS, 7 Plaintiff, DECLARATION OF J. TALITHA v. **HAZELTON** 8 CITY OF SEATTLE, 9 Defendant. 10 I, J. Talitha Hazelton, declare and state as follows: 11 1. The information contained in this declaration is true and correct to the best of my 12 knowledge, and I am of majority age and competent to testify about the matters set 13 forth herein. 14 2. On August 3, 2020 at 10:00AM I conferred with Assistant City Attorney Ghazal 15 Sharifi via telephone number 206-684-8217. 16 3. The conversation lasted no longer than 3 minutes upon review of the call length 17 detail for the conversation on August 3, 2020 at 10:00AM via my cell phone's call 18 log history. 19 4. Counsel identified herself and plaintiffs and conversed with what appeared to be a 20 bewildered assistant city attorney. Ms Sharifi seemed confused by fact that plaintiffs 21 were seeking a TRO, considering Judge Jones' issuance of a TRO in June and Judge 22 Robart's entry of an injunction in July. 23

Case 2:20-cv-01174-RAJ Document 24 Filed 08/06/20 Page 2 of 2

5. The goal of the conversation from undersigned counsel's end was to obtain, via conference with Ms. Sharifi, the foregone response: no, the City would not agree to be bound by a TRO that limits the munitions officers can utilize at protests. 6. I received the impression that Ms. Sharifi was under the misapprehension that I was unaware of the pending actions. Thus, I curtly assured Ms. Sharifi yes, I recognized there was another suit. Yes, I recognize Judge Robart issued an order related to the consent decree. Yet, and still, I am inquiring (as it is our position that after July 25, 2020 said orders are insufficient): will you agree to this proposed TRO? 7. The city indicated it would not.

/s/ J. Talitha Hazelton J. Talitha Hazelton